



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,571	02/08/2002	John P. McKearn	2789/6/US	1890
7590	02/04/2004		EXAMINER	
Carol M. Nielsen Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP 1000 Louisiana Suite 3400 Houston, TX 77002-5007			LANDSMAN, ROBERT S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1647	
DATE MAILED: 02/04/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/072,571	MCKEARN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Robert Landsman	1647		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Priority under 35 USC § 120 and 121

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/8/02.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Formal Matters

A. Claims 1-12 are pending in the application and were subject to restriction in the Paper dated 11/28/03. In the Response dated 12/29/03, Applicants elected SEQ ID NO:1, with traverse. Applicants argue that simultaneous examination of the inventions does not impose an undue burden of examination on the Examiner. This argument has been considered, but is not deemed persuasive. The present invention recites 48 independent and distinct sequences, each requiring their own, non-overlapping search. This would be burdensome. Therefore, this restriction is deemed proper and is, therefore, made FINAL.

B. The Information Disclosure Statement filed 2/8/02 has been entered into the record.

2. Specification

A. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The claim is drawn to an IL-3 composition.

3. Information Disclosure Statement

A. References AF-AL on the 1449 dated 2/8/03 has been lined through since no publication date was cited. As of the time of this Office Action, the Examiner was not able to obtain this information. Therefore, a new 1449 with these publication dates should be submitted if desired.

4. Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1647

A. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 1 of U. S. Patent No. 6,153,183 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: both the patent and the present application recite an IL-3 mutant of SEQ ID NO:1.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Due to the complexity of the claimed sequences and length of the claims, it is not clear if U.S. Patent No. 5,604,116; 5,677,149; 5,817,486; 6,017,523; 6,458,931 should also be included in this rejection. Therefore, the present invention is rejected under these patents as well. If Applicants are aware of any other patents which comprise SEQ ID NO:1, they are requested to bring these to the Examiner's attention, or to supply a list of the pertinent claims for these patents in order for the Examiner to make that decision. However, due to the length of the claims and the number of potential applications involved in this double patenting rejection, the Examiner does ask Applicants to supply patents which they believe would be considered double patenting with the present invention.

B. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over one or more claims of copending Application No. 08/446,871. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: both the patent and the present application recite an IL-3 mutant of SEQ ID NO:1.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Furthermore, claim 1 of the present invention is also rejected over U.S. Patent Applications 07/832,844; 08/468,688; 10/078,113; 10/083,446; 10/090,128; 10/144,322 since these applications also recite IL-3 mutants. If Applicants are aware of any other applications which comprise SEQ ID NO:1, they are

requested to bring these to the Examiner's attention, or to supply a list of the pertinent claims for these applications in order for the Examiner to make that decision. However, due to the length of the claims and the number of potential applications involved in this double patenting rejection, the Examiner does ask Applicants to supply applications which they believe would be considered double patenting with the present invention.

5. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph – enablement

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

A. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In In re Wands, 8USPQ2d, 1400 (CAFC 1988) page 1404, the factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

It has been noticed that numerous patents in this series of IL-3 mutant cases have issued only upon the addition of the following functional language:

“and said human interleukin-3 mutant polypeptide has at least three times greater activity than native human interleukin-3, in at least one assay selected from the group consisting of: AML cell proliferation and TF-1 cell proliferation.”

Therefore, Applicants are required to amend the claim to recite this limitation, or to provide an explanation as to why this limitation is not required.

6. Conclusion

A. No claim is allowable.

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Landsman whose telephone number is (703) 306-3407. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM (Eastern time) and alternate Fridays from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM (Eastern time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached on (703) 308-4623.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 308-4242. Fax draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (703) 308-0294.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Robert Landsman, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Group 1600
February 02, 2004



ROBERT LANDSMAN
PATENT EXAMINER